

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-15, and 17-33 are currently pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1, 10, 20, and 28 are independent.

**Rejections**

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-15, 17-22, and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,988,190 B1 to Park ("Park").

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of U.S. Patent 6,427,204 B1 to Arimilli et al. ("Arimilli").

Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of U.S. Patent 6,018,798 to Witt et al. ("Witt").

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

Independent claim 1 recites control flow logic to dispatch a dependency descriptor including dependency information for an instruction sequence and data flow logic to execute the instruction sequence according to the dependency information in a received dependency descriptor.

Independent claim 10 recites data flow logic to receive a dependency descriptor dispatched from control flow logic and to execute an instruction sequence according to dependency information in the received dependency descriptor.

Independent claims 20 and 28 recite dispatching a dependency descriptor for execution and executing a set of instructions according to dependency information in the dispatched dependency descriptor.

Applicant respectfully submits none of the references cited in these rejections, whether alone or in any obvious combination with one another, taught or suggested such features as claimed.

More particularly, Applicant respectfully submits current loop iteration count 506 and total loop iteration count 508 of Park cannot be equated with dependency information as claimed by Applicant.

Applicant understands, with reference to Figure 5 of Park, that reading from address trace cache 220 of start address 502, end address 504, current loop iteration count 506, and total loop iteration count 508 for a corresponding routine is being equated with Applicant's claimed fetching of a trace descriptor. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Park did not teach or suggest any separate dispatch of a dependency descriptor including current loop iteration count 506 and total loop iteration count 508 for execution of the corresponding routine.

Applicant respectfully submits that Park taught that current loop iteration count 506 and total loop iteration count 508 are used to identify whether or not to execute a corresponding routine in the first place. See, e.g., Park in column 4 at lines 35-56. Even assuming for argument's sake that Park taught or suggested dispatch of a descriptor for execution of the corresponding routine, Applicant respectfully submits that counts 506 and 508 would have therefore been used to identify whether or not to dispatch the descriptor for execution of the corresponding routine. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that any dispatch of any such descriptor would not have included counts 506 and 508 in the descriptor because Park did not teach or suggest that execution of the corresponding routine itself uses count 506 or 508.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Park did not teach or suggest dispatch of a dependency descriptor having dependency information as claimed and that Park did not teach or suggest execution of an instruction sequence (claims 1 and 10) or a set of instructions (claims 20 and 28) according to dependency information in a dependency descriptor as claimed.

Noting the remaining rejected claims depend from independent claim 1, 10, 20, or 28, Applicant therefore respectfully submits these rejections have been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Note that there may be additional reasons for the patentability of claims. For example, there may be additional reasons why the dependent claims are patentable.

It is respectfully submitted this patent application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to help expedite the prosecution of this patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 29, 2006

/Matthew C. Fagan, Reg. No. 37,542/

Matthew C. Fagan  
Registration No. 37,542  
Telephone: (512) 732-3936  
Facsimile: (512) 732-3912 (please call first)

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, L.L.P.  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
Telephone: (503) 439-8778  
Telephone: (310) 207-3800

Page 10 of 10

U.S. APPLICATION NO. 10/037,666  
ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO. 42390P11927